



November 8, 1979

## The Alaska Corrections Master Plan: Legislative Implications

Roger V. Endell

---

### **Suggested citation**

Endell, Roger V. (1979). *The Alaska Corrections Master Plan: Legislative Implications*. Report prepared for the Committee on Finance, Alaska House of Representatives. Anchorage, AK: Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

### **Summary**

This paper provides to members of the Alaska State Legislature a summary of those areas of the Alaska Corrections Master Plan which have obvious legislative implications. It includes recommendations for (1) statutory changes, (2) operational funding (personnel), and (3) capital improvements above and beyond the "normal" correctional budgetary process. It is not an all-inclusive narrative summary of the Master Plan. The summary provides page reference numbers to the Master Plan, general topics, and a brief description of the recommendations under the three major topical headings listed above.

### **Additional information**

The final *Alaska Corrections Master Plan* (1979) and *Alaska Corrections Master Plan: Executive Summary* (Moyer Associates, Inc., August 1979) are available through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), U.S. Department of Justice.

THE ALASKA CORRECTIONS MASTER PLAN:  
LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS



**JUSTICE CENTER**

**University of Alaska, Anchorage  
Anchorage, Alaska**

THE ALASKA CORRECTIONS MASTER PLAN:  
LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS

Prepared for the  
ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Chairman: Representative Russ Meekins

Members:

Oral Freeman	Phillip Guy
Jim Duncan	Joe McKinnon
H. Moss	Brian Rogers
E. J. Haugen	Joe Montgomery

by

Roger V. Endell  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska  
Anchorage, Alaska

November 8, 1979

JC 7913.02

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

COST CONSIDERATION . . . . .	1
FACTORS AFFECTING CORRECTIONS POPULATIONS. . . . .	4
SENTENCING, PRETRIAL RELEASE AND PAROLE DECISIONS . . . . .	10
RECOMMENDED STATUTORY CHANGES. . . . .	13
RECOMMENDED OPERATIONAL FUNDING, PERSONNEL . . . . .	18
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, FUNDING ACQUIRED . . . . .	22
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, FUNDING NEEDED . . . . .	23
CONCLUSION . . . . .	25

## INTRODUCTION

This paper has been developed for the purpose of presenting to the members of the legislature a succinct summary of the voluminous (600 page) Alaska Corrections Master Plan. The summary is purposely structured to indicate those areas of the Plan which have obvious legislative implications. That is, this summary includes only recommendations for 1) statutory changes, 2) operational funding (personnel), and 3) capital improvements above and beyond the "normal" correctional budgetary process. It is not an all-inclusive narrative summary of the Master Plan. Two executive summaries do exist which provide narrative descriptions of the Plan's contents. (See Alaska Corrections Master Plan: A Preliminary Draft Summary by Roger Endell, July 11, 1979 and Alaska Corrections Master Plan: Executive Summary by Moyer Associates, Inc., August 1979.)

This summary does not address Division of Corrections policies and procedures or Administrative Code issues directly. Changes in Division operational practices will no doubt follow legislative review and, conversely, action and major changes which may result from a review of this document and/or the entire Master Plan will have implications for correctional policy changes.

The summary provides for page reference numbers, general topics, and a brief description of the recommendations under the three major topical headings listed above. Detailed information can be found in the Master Plan volume which will explore the reasoning and justification for these recommendations.

Finally, the introduction narrative and the specific recommendations are provided here without editorial comment. These statements are extracted from the Plan as nearly as possible to the original wording. There, of course, is a risk that the summary and/or recommendations contained within are subject to misinterpretation because of the out-of-context and out-of-sequence format. The reader is asked to seek further information from the Plan via the reference number whenever questions may arise.

## COST CONSIDERATIONS

### Discussion

#### REFERENCES

Page	Topic
------	-------

33	Summary
----	---------

A fundamental goal of recommendations that this master plan has is the provision of the most adequate corrections system for Alaska at the least possible cost. The single most effective means of accomplishing this is to avoid unnecessary incarceration of offenders, thereby avoiding the capital cost of constructing new facilities to accommodate growing inmate populations. Avoidance of unnecessary incarceration in turn requires development of a full range of community-based corrections programs, including pretrial release, probation, prerelease and parole supervision. This is the basic strategy advocated throughout the plan.

Alaska will not be able to avoid a certain level of capital expenditures to improve its corrections facility system, due to several factors:

1. The badly deteriorated condition of several existing facilities.
2. Overcrowding of a few key facilities even at current inmate population levels.
3. Inadequate space for programs and prison industries at nearly all existing facilities.
4. Court actions, both actual and potential, which will mandate that Alaska provide constitutional housing for all inmates.
5. The long-range goal to return all Alaskan inmates from federal institutions to state facilities (some of these inmates have very lengthy sentences and could not be adequately accommodated in any existing Alaskan facility).
6. Expressed interest in regionalized incarceration of sentenced inmates, which would require replacement of existing rural corrections facilities, which are now totally inadequate to house long-term inmates.

However, capital expenditures can be minimized through development of a full complement of community corrections alternatives to incarceration, and the delaying of all but the most essential construction or renovation until the full impact of diversion efforts can be achieved.

On the cost-effectiveness balance sheet, there are two types of expenditures which must be weighed: operating costs (primarily staff salaries) and capital costs (for construction). The improvement and expansion of adult community corrections services will require additional personnel as well as increased funds for the Division of Corrections' use in contracting for services for offenders. To offer statewide pretrial assessment and supervision services, prerelease programs and improved probation and parole supervision (using a tri-level caseload classification) would require an estimated 15 to 24 additional line staff positions in adult community corrections with today's workload levels. If workloads continue to grow at rates observed over the past eight years, staff needs could increase by as much as 40 percent by 1990, requiring creating of an additional 17 to 20 line staff positions. Staff requirements can be minimized through more concerted use of volunteers, but it is likely that over the next ten years, a full-fledged adult community corrections effort will require the addition of at least 30 full-time line staff. If the salaries and associated cost of each new position is estimated to average \$38,000 annually over this same time period, this would represent an increase in the annual operating budget of about \$1.15 million by 1990. Or, from another perspective, assuming that five new staff are added in each of the next three years and two every year for the next seven years, the estimated total additional staff cost over the next ten years would be \$7.3 million. If additional funds are made available for contractual services averaging \$200,000 annually, the total operating cost increase could be nearly \$10 million over the next ten years.

Similar estimates of the cost of improving youth services are made in that section of the plan, which concludes that the current budget of approximately \$2.3 million now spent on probation and contractual services for youths would grow to a total estimated annual budget of \$9.5 million in 1990. This would represent a cost of about \$7.2 million over the ten-year period to improve and expand community corrections alternatives for delinquent youths.

These increases in operating costs must be compared to the cost of constructing additional bedspace capacity to accommodate inmates who could be diverted to community services if they are available and adequate. If the cost of an Alaskan prison construction project is estimated to average \$107,000 per bedspace (see facility recommendations section of plan), then Alaska must avoid building only 94 adult bedspaces

over the next ten years to offset the total cost of improved community corrections services in that same period ( $\$10 \text{ million} \div \$107,000 = 94$ ). In fact, construction cost savings over the next 20 years which could be attributed to improved ROR and prerelease programs total over \$36 million (the bedspace savings would total about 345), more than four times the additional ten-year cost of improved adult community corrections services (and approximately twice the 20-year cost). On the youth services side, if just the current out-of-state placement cost of about \$600,000 could be avoided through improved community-based programs for youths, the entire cost of such improvements would be offset. It is logical to assume that other operating cost savings would also accrue over the ten years due to decreased rates of preadjudication detention and post-adjudication commitment of youths (this is true of adult corrections as well).

Therefore, although it might seem like a large increase in funding, increased expenditures on improved community corrections services can actually result in an overall budgetary savings over time through avoidance of massive capital (construction) expenditures and decreases in institutional operating costs. If cost-effectiveness is of paramount importance, the course of action which Alaska must follow is clear. Community programs must be fully funded and staffed to safely divert the maximum possible number of offenders from unnecessary pretrial and posttrial incarceration.



FACTORS AFFECTING  
CORRECTIONS POPULATIONS

Discussion

REFERENCES

Page Tonic

342 Population      The size and characteristics of offender populations  
to Factors      in a corrections system should determine the policies  
346      and practices of that system. In order to effectively  
supervise and serve the needs of offenders on probation  
and parole, or incarcerated in jails and prisons, it  
is necessary to know the number and types of persons  
who make up these populations. Therefore, in order  
to plan for the future of corrections in Alaska, an  
awareness of the variables which interact to determine  
the number and types of offenders passing through its  
corrections system is essential. Based on an under-  
standing of the factors which affect the size and  
qualities of probation, parole, jail and prison popula-  
tions, policy-makers can choose future courses of  
action with greater confidence of attaining their  
desired outcomes.

Relationships between variables determining correc-  
tions populations can be viewed from both a mathematical  
and conceptual perspective. The mathematical relation-  
ship between population levels, admissions to and  
lengths of stay in corrections programs and facilities  
is relatively straightforward:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{Average} & & \text{Number of Admissions} \\ \text{Daily} & = & \text{Per Year} \\ \text{Population} & & \end{array} \times \frac{\text{Average Length of Stay (in months)}}{12 \text{ months}}$$

Thus, the average number of inmates in a prison (or on  
probation or parole) is directly related to the number  
of offenders admitted and their average length of stay  
in the facility or program.

In Alaska, the average monthly inmate population has  
grown from 440 in 1972 to approximately 720 at the end  
of 1978; this represents a nearly 64 percent increase  
in the size of the inmate population. Total adult  
admissions (including pre- and post-sentenced offenders)  
increased only about 25 percent in a similar period  
(1972 through 1977), while total person-days served  
by those admitted increased 32 percent in this 6-year  
interval. Thus, the increase in inmate population is

apparently attributable to an interaction between increased admissions and increased length of stay for at least a proportion of these admissions. As noted elsewhere, the probation/parole average monthly case-load has grown approximately 36 percent in the same time period, a less dramatic but still significant increase.

Although the mathematical relationships between populations, admissions and lengths of stay is apparently simple, the policies, practices and demographic variables which determine these basic factors interact in a complex manner. The number of admissions to a corrections facility or program is dependent on:

1. the crime rate: the number of crimes committed per 100,000 persons in the general population;
2. the arrest rate: the number of persons apprehended by law enforcement agencies;
3. the conviction rate: the proportion of those arrested who are found guilty; and
4. sentencing statutes and practices: the penalties prescribed by the legislature for each crime, judicial decisions and, informally, some prosecutorial discretion in choosing the sentence for each convicted offender.

These variables are in turn linked with other political and socioeconomic factors in a casual chain which has yet to be unraveled; employment levels, the age-group and racial/ethnic composition of the general population, and punishment philosophies of legislators, judges, administrators and the general public all have an impact on the criminal justice system, and therefore, on corrections populations.

The average length of stay of convicted offenders in corrections programs or facilities is a direct result of:

1. Sentencing statutes and practices; the length of offenders' sentences as determined by legislative statutes and judicial and prosecutorial discretion.
2. Paroling statutes and practices (affecting both prison and parole populations): determined by statute and parole board discretion.

3. "Good-time" statutes and practices (also affecting both prison and parole populations) determined by statute and Department of Corrections staff discretion.

Many of the same philosophies that shape the commitment practices of a state also have an impact on the length of time that offenders are expected to remain the responsibility of the corrections system.

Upon examination of the factors outlined above, it becomes apparent that corrections population levels are the end result of a complex series of decisions, most of which fall outside the jurisdiction of corrections systems. Reasons advanced for the spiraling increases in prison populations reflect the impact of these external forces. Prominent among these reasons are rising crime rates and unemployment levels, improved law enforcement, more efficient court processing, tougher attitudes toward offenders, and the age-group composition of the population.

Rising crime rates, linked by some to the depressed economy and higher unemployment rates of recent years, are often cited as a primary cause of growth in prison populations. However, reported crime rates may have shown a spurious increase in the past few years due to improved reporting methods. The rise in crime rates may in fact be abating; serious reported crime decreased nine percent nationwide during the first three months of 1977 when compared with the same period of 1976. In Alaska, the violent crime rate also showed a decline from 1975 to 1976. In addition, crime rates have historically had little or no correlation with incarceration rates, perhaps in part because of unreliable reporting and most probably because there are a large number of factors intervening between commission of a crime and commitment to prison. The impact of crime rate statistics on public attitudes toward criminals cannot be under-estimated; this may be the most direct causal link between reported increases in crime and rising prison populations. Societal fear of and a punitive response to criminal behavior have undoubtedly been exacerbated by an increased public awareness of crime.

Unemployment, which theoretically may motivate some types of criminal behavior, has been shown to be directly correlated with incarceration rates in many jurisdictions. Thus, as unemployment increases, incarceration rates often rise after a short time. However, as with crime rates, future unemployment levels cannot be accurately predicted, so they cannot

be reliably utilized as indicators for prison population projections.

Improved law enforcement, which can cause increases in both arrest and conviction rates, has also probably contributed to increased corrections populations. Similarly, more efficient court processing of criminal cases has probably been a factor in increased conviction rates, and in some jurisdictions has shifted the balance from pretrial to post-sentence incarceration (by shortening the length of time from arrest to sentencing for some jail inmates). The precise quantitative impact of improved law enforcement and court processing is difficult to estimate, either for present or future corrections population levels.

A changing attitude toward offenders, which has been evolving into a "get tough" stance, can affect both statutory and discretionary aspects of criminal Justice decision-making. The sentencing of a greater proportion of offenders to lengthier periods of confinement under more stringent parole policies will have a significant impact on prison populations and probation and parole caseloads. At present there are several divergent nationwide trends in correctional philosophies, which, coupled with regional differences in outlook, can have varying effects on corrections populations. An emphasis on reintegration of offenders through use of community corrections approaches would tend to reduce the number of persons confined in jails and prisons and increase probation and parole caseloads. On the other hand, a narrowly defined determinate sentencing structure (i.e., with definite terms but no shortening of existing minimum sentences) could cause substantial growth in incarcerated populations. The revised Criminal Code recently enacted in Alaska may increase the average daily inmate population by as much as 50 percent (see chapter on criminal justice decision-making for estimation methodology). Through an emphasis on community corrections and a more determinate sentencing structure are not inherently incompatible, careful consideration must be given to the impact upon inmate population size of lengthy determinate sentences for certain offenders.

One factor which is being increasingly utilized to predict the number of inmates who will be confined is the age-group composition of the general population. Incarceration rates are correlated with the size of the population between ages 18 and 34; this group is defined as being "at risk," since persons in this age range are most likely to be sentenced to incarceration.

Nationally, nearly 80 percent of the inmate population is part of this at-risk group. Since the U. S. and state census bureaus routinely develop future projections of the size of the general population, categorized by age groups, it is possible to use these projections in developing corrections population projections. However, this age group at-risk factor is also the one least amenable to change through legislation or policy-making, and so affords corrections administrators little guidance in effecting changes which may have a positive impact on their system. It is, quite simply, an effective tool for predicting the future size of corrections populations if statutes, policies and practices remain unchanged. Effective planning must include not only consideration of the outcome of current practices, but also an assessment of a range of options which require or assume system changes. In the realm of corrections population levels, small changes in any of a number of factors previously discussed can have a resounding impact.

Because substantial increases in Alaska's prison population are placing increasing pressure on many of the State's older and more deteriorated facilities, it may well be that a decrease in the inmate population is both necessary and desirable, so as to minimize the need for new construction. If so, some or all of the variables previously discussed as having an impact on the number of admissions and/or average lengths of stay could conceivably be modified to attain the desired decrease. Eliminating those factors which are less amenable to change (e.g., crime, arrest, conviction and unemployment rates, as well as the size of the at-risk age group), it is possible to pinpoint the factors which can reasonably be manipulated. A decrease in prison admissions can be accomplished through:

1. decriminalization of selected victimless or minor offenses;
2. increased use of diversion options prior to sentencing;
3. more efficient presentence release programs which shorten the length of time eligible defendants are detained prior to release; and/or
4. increased use of nonincarceratory sentences for a larger proportion of convicted offenders; these alternatives can include fines, restitution, probation and/or periodic imprisonment (work release).

A decrease in the average length of stay of prison inmates can be achieved through:

1. a reduction in the maximum sentences imposed for crimes, either through statutory change or modifications in judicial sentencing practices; and/or
2. an increase in the release rate, through an augmented parole granting rate, increased awarding of "good time," or more frequent use of prerelease programs for inmates serving the last months of their sentence.

Although some of these measures are more attainable and acceptable in the short run than others, all would have the impact of decreasing the prison inmate population, while some would increase either probation or parole workloads.

The objective is therefore to provide Alaska's corrections and criminal justice decision-makers with alternative courses of action regarding institutional corrections, as well as their cost implications, so that informed choices can be made regarding the future of Alaska's corrections system. For example, an analysis of current practices indicates the need for sound planning.

If current practices affecting inmate population size were to continue unchanged, Alaska would need to house an average daily population of somewhat over 1100 inmates by the year 2000 (this includes all females, federally housed prisoners and presentence detainees).

At the same time, it should be noted that the monthly and even daily fluctuation in Corrections population is substantial, apparently amounting to as much as 20% of the average figure on occasions. Due to this high variability, it seems likely that considerable attention could be given to either providing temporary additional holding capacity or to management programs which seek to damp out the daily and monthly variations, instead of attempting to provide the maximum number of cells for the highest possible number of prisoners.

SENTENCING, PRETRIAL RELEASE AND  
PAROLE DECISIONS

Discussion

REFERENCES

Page Topic

---

535 Sentencing Although each is in a separate branch of government,  
to the corrections system is really the instrument of the  
536 courts. The courts determine the sentences of offenders  
and the corrections system carries them out. The  
effective use of a corrections system is therefore  
highly dependent on the quality of sentencing.

557 Imprisonment is the most serious and most costly of  
to the sentencing alternatives. If the courts send more  
560 offenders to prison than belong there, institutional  
resources are strained and wasted, and the quality of  
services and treatment for all imprisoned persons  
deteriorates -- in the end too much of the public's  
money must be expended on the construction and opera-  
tion of institutions. On the other hand, if persons  
are placed on probation who belong in prison, the  
corrections system cannot provide the degree of protec-  
tion to which the public is entitled.

Aside from sentencing decisions, there is one other  
decision in which the court system prevails which has  
a direct effect upon corrections: pretrial release.  
The policies and practices of the courts determine  
which defendants will be released pending trial and  
which of them will be detained in corrections facilities.  
Thus, the courts largely determine the size of the  
unsentenced prisoner population detained in Alaska's  
corrections facilities. As has been documented else-  
where in the plan, both the criteria used to assess  
defendants' eligibility for pretrial release and the  
speed with which such release is effected can have a  
substantial impact on the size of the average daily  
prisoner population. Although the Division of Correc-  
tions can aid the court system in developing a compre-  
hensive pretrial release program through offering  
prompt assessment services and supervision for selected  
releasees, the decision ultimately rests with the  
court, and the consequences must be borne by the  
Division's institutions and community services.

The capacity requirements for correctional institutions  
could increase substantially over the next several  
years due to implementing the revised Criminal Code.

The cost implications of this increased inmate population, both in capital and operating expenditures, are significant (discussed in detail in the adult institutions section of the plan). The source of the population increase can be traced directly to the longer average length of stay which is likely to result from enacting the new Code. Thus, it would appear that although some of the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice goals may have been achieved by this new Code, particularly those related to limiting judicial and Parole Board discretion, the unintended consequence of enacting the revised Criminal Code may well be to inflate the sentenced inmate population of Alaska's correctional institutions to extraordinarily high levels.

Alaska's revised Criminal Code is a comprehensive attempt at sentencing reform which, unfortunately, may not go far enough to eliminate sentencing disparity, and which also may go too far in imposing lengthy sentences on recidivist felons.

Parole policies and practices have as direct an effect on corrections as do court actions in pretrial release and sentencing decisions. Parole policies determine, within statutory and judicially determined limits, the length of time a sentenced inmate serves in prison, and the type of conditions that are imposed on his or her parole. The criteria used by the Alaska Parole Board in its decision-making shape the manner in which the Division of Corrections utilizes its institutional and community supervision resources.

Parole services should not be discontinued; whether releasees are released through Parole Board action or at the end of a sentence determined by statute and guidelines, most will continue to require some type of "depressurization" to help them adjust to life in their home communities. Prerelease programs operated by the Division, such as work release and furlough, will become even more critical if parole is abolished. At this juncture, it may also prove to be necessary to statutorily provide for some portion of the end of every sentence to incarceration to be served under community supervision (similar to the mandatory release law now in effect).

It is not likely that parole decision-making will be abolished in Alaska in the near future, since such a step would require a thorough reexamination of the revised Criminal Code, and concerted efforts to develop a guidelines matrix for sentencing decisions which



could eliminate the need for Parole Board sentence adjustments. In addition, all inmates sentenced under old sentencing statutes will continue to be eligible for parole for some time to come. Therefore, given that the Parole Board will continue to function in Alaska for the foreseeable future, it is important that the Parole Board's policies and practices are consistent with the state's overall corrections philosophy, and that the Board is provided with sufficient resources and authority to efficiently accomplish its responsibilities.

Implementing any sentencing or parole reform requires the highest level of cooperation between the judiciary, the legislature, law enforcement, and the Division of Corrections. Corrections alone cannot hope to improve Alaska's sentencing or pretrial release practices; only with the cooperation of the other decision-makers involved can true and lasting improvements be achieved. In the relationship between corrections and the courts, corrections planning necessarily must become criminal justice system planning as well.

## RECOMMENDED STATUTORY CHANGES

### Discussion

#### REFERENCES

##### Page Tonic

70	Management	In the interests of unifying correctional services in Alaska, it is recommended that the Department of Public Safety no longer have responsibility for any jail contracts and that the Division of Corrections assume responsibility for administering all present and future local jail contracts for the State of Alaska.
79	Management	Appointment of a five member Correctional (Statewide) Advisory Board is recommended.
133	Community Services	Legislation should prescribe uniform policies and procedures for screening and investigating persons awaiting trial as to their suitability for pretrial release and provision for supervision of any persons granted pretrial release who are deemed to require it. The legislation should authorize community corrections staff to carry out this function and provide funds for staff.
147 and 540	Community Services	<p>The statutes should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. a uniform criteria for eligibility for pretrial release;</li><li>2. preliminary screening of all potential candidates by community services personnel, (including para-professionals and/or trained volunteers) with phone verification of all information;</li><li>3. pretrial release recommendations by community services personnel to the district attorneys and courts;</li><li>4. supervision by community services personnel of selected persons on pretrial release; and</li><li>5. consideration should be given to a procedure under which persons charged with relatively minor offenses and who do not have a significant criminal history may have their charges dropped or suspended following a period of successful adjustment in the pretrial program.</li></ol>
205 and 206	Classification	Statutes should consolidate the policies and procedures relating to the various types of furloughs, work release and halfway houses. Assignment to these types

REFERENCES

Page Topic

of programs should be delegated to the institutional superintendents. The Parole Board should also be authorized to require the assignment of individual prisoners to any of these programs prior to the effective dates of parole release, as a means of prerelease testing.

224	Programs	Chief of Programs position is to be created in the Control Office management structure of the Division of Corrections. This officer each year will prepare an annual plan, in consultation with each institution program director, to support institutional program development and operation including personnel, equipment and contractual program arrangements for the rehabilitation of offenders within each institution. The program budget should be a separate line item in annual appropriations.
226	Programs	Legislation should be provided which would assign to the public school system the responsibility for providing educational instruction through the 12th grade within correctional institutions. It is recommended that contractual arrangements with personnel of local colleges for programs of higher education within correctional institutions should be obtained and expanded.
	Industries	Alaska is one of only three states which does not have a prison industry law (the others are Delaware and Nevada). Prison industries statutes should be drafted which would include:
295		1. establish prison industry program and generally define its purpose;
297		2. establishment of a Prison Industry Advisory Board whose members should be appointed by the Governor;
295		3. establishment of a Prison Industry Revolving Fund;
296		4. authority to sell prison industry goods on the open market, possibly through existing in-state vendors;
296 to 298		5. authority to lease prison facilities and grounds to private businesses which would employ prisoner-workers in such facilities or on such grounds;

## REFERENCES

### Page Topic

- |                           |            |  |
|---------------------------|------------|--|
| 299                       | Industries | 6. exemption of prison industry workers from the \$3.00 per day ceiling on wages established by law by Alaska 33.30.225;   |
| 298                       |            | 7. establish the position of director of the prison industry program with a requirement for considerable management experience and with powers and duties described;   |
| 299                       |            | 8. require that all prison industry operations observe the state and federal health and safety regulations;  |
| 299<br>and<br>304-<br>313 |            | 9. define the specific purposes for which prisoner's wages can be dispersed including (legislation should <u>not</u> fix prisoner wages): support of the prisoners' dependents, reimbursement to the state for an award made for violent crimes compensation, payment of a court award, reimbursement to the state for room and board (not to exceed the average daily cost of incarceration); purchase of clothing and commissary items, enforced savings to assure that funds will be available upon release.  |
| 479                       | Alcohol    | Legislation should authorize the State Office of Alcoholism, and provide necessary appropriation, to establish alcohol sleep-off centers in all communities where state-operated correctional institutions or contract jails are now being used for persons detained under the 12-hour detention law (the Uniform Alcoholism Act adopted in 1972). And, as recommended by the Governor's Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee on Alcoholism, similar centers should be established in other communities demonstrating a need for them. The centers should be operated on a contract basis by local agencies or groups, subject to standards issued by the Office of Alcoholism. The Office of Alcoholism should be allowed full authority to design and operate alcoholism treatment programs, both in correctional institutions and in the community. |
| 519                       | Training   | <u>See</u> comment under Operational Funding -- Personnel (attachment listing, page 519) for legislation recommended for correctional training.  |
| 572<br>and<br>573         | Parole     | It is recommended that legislation be created providing that:<br><br>1. the Alaska Board of Parole be composed of three full-time members;   |

## REFERENCES

Page	Topic
------	-------

572 and 573	Parole
-------------------	--------

2. appointment be made by the Governor from a panel of candidates submitted by the Commissioner of Health and Social Services, preferably with the aid of an intergovernmental committee;

3. candidates for appointment to the Board should have a background of education and experience in the social or behavioral sciences, criminal justice, the law or clinical practice;

4. the Board should represent the major ethnic and minority groups found in Alaska;

5. the salary of Board members should provide adequate compensation for their work. (Elsewhere the plan cites the American Correctional Association Commission standards which recommends that "salaries of parole board members are comparable to those paid judges of courts of general jurisdiction (or highest trial court ). In Alaska this salary would be equivalent to that of a Superior Court judge.);

6. the Board members should be located in Juneau;

7. the Governor should designate one of the members as chairman who would serve as the operational head of the Board.

575	Parole
-----	--------

Legislation should be considered to allow the Parole Board to give parolees whose paroles have been revoked credit on their sentence for time served on parole between the date of release from an institution and the date of arrest for a violation of parole conditions. The Board should be authorized by legislation to discharge from parole status at any time after two years (for persons with sentences of more than ten years) parolees who in the judgment of at least two members of the Board have so conducted themselves that they are unlikely to become again involved in violations of the law. Affirmative decisions should be made administratively, without the necessity for a hearing. However, when in the judgment of at least two members of the Board, discharge from parole should be denied, a hearing should be granted the individual parolee.

Consideration should be given to legislation, and/or changes in Parole Board procedure, under which the Board would conduct initial hearings, in the case of

## REFERENCES

### Page Topic

---

575	Parole	prisoners with maximum sentences of five years or less, within four months of their commitment. At these hearings a presumptive release date should be set either by parole or by mandatory release (the latter in effect a denial). Prisoners with maximum terms of more than five years would be heard at least a month prior to the completion of the minimum terms, also for the purpose of setting a presumptive release date, either by parole or by mandatory release, setting an effective date of parole or setting a future date for a reconsideration hearing.
205 and 206	Parole	See comment at reference page 205, <u>Classification section</u> , Statutory Changes, regarding Parole Board authorization to assign individuals to prerelease programs.

RECOMMENDED  
OPERATIONAL FUNDING; PERSONNEL

Discussion

REFERENCES

Page Topic

71 Management A function essential to the future operations of  
and Alaska's institutions is program development. At  
224 present, there are few organized treatment programs  
available to inmates of Alaska's correctional facilities.  
In order to encourage coordinated development of such  
programs, an organizational focus on institutional  
programs will be essential. Creation of a position  
of "Program Coordinator" will satisfy this need;  
the staff person in this position would have respon-  
sibility for developing program policies, strategies  
and standards for all institutions. This officer would  
report to the Adult Institution Administrator and  
be located in the Central Office.

75 Management Because volunteers can be involved in a broad range of  
activities with offenders, including institutional and  
community programs, it is important that volunteer  
coordination be administratively placed in a centralized  
unit not identified with one type of correctional  
program more strongly than another. Since volunteers  
provide a very valuable additional staff resource for  
corrections, association of this function with other  
control services is logical. Addition of a Volunteer  
Coordinator to the responsibilities of the Central  
Staff Services unit is recommended.

Other Central Office management positions recommended  
in the plan include:

- 76 1. a standard setting, inspection and architectural  
and capital development specialist;
- 77 2. a certified public accountant for budget  
development;
- 79 3. a public information officer;
- 140 4. at least one research/planner/data analyst  
who is assigned to work full time on community  
services problems.

Field staff include:

- 143 Community 1. five community correctional personnel, client  
Services classification and differential association (first  
priority);

## REFERENCES

### Page Topic

143	Community Services	<p>2. eleven community correctional personnel, pre-trial assessment and supervision;</p> <p>3. four paraprofessional and/or volunteer assessment and supervision personnel;</p> <p>4. five community correctional personnel, pre-release programs (i.e., adult community corrections will retain about 27 full time probation officer positions (including only line P.O. II and III) with transfer of some to juvenile services, the 24 positions above will be needed to implement fully the community corrections program including restitution and community service sentences provided for in the new Criminal Code. The reduction in the incarcerated population (and thus the capacity required to be provided in facilities) to be attained through even partial or gradual implementation of expanded community service programs are substantial enough to justify addition of needed staff and funds for providing and contracting for services. The long run cost benefits of maximal use of alternatives to incarceration, particularly in Alaska where new construction can potentially be minimized or avoided, are undeniable (without significant increased risks to public safety) through close community supervision).</p>
227		Program counselor positions: Nome Correctional Center and Ketchikan Correctional Center.
234 and 300 to 303	Industries	<p>Prison Industries (short range):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prison Industry Director (central office);</li> <li>2. Prison Industry Cost Accountant (central office);</li> <li>3. Prison Industry Shop Supervisors (initially Eagle River, Fairbanks, Juneau, Palmer).</li> </ol> <p>Prison Industries (long range):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Salesperson (Anchorage area);</li> <li>2. Industrial Engineer (central office);</li> <li>3. Planner/Analyst (central office);</li> </ol>



## REFERENCES

Page	Topic	
234 and 300 to 303	Industries	<p>4. Assistant Accountant (Palmer Correctional Center);</p> <p>5. Industry Manager (Palmer Correctional Center).</p>
320	Health	One full time registered nurse per correctional institution with shared services between some institutions (e.g., Eagle River/Ridgeview; two Ketchikan institutions).
314 to 329	Health	Contractual arrangements for medical, dental, mental health, alcohol and drug treatment personnel and services are recommended to be implemented under the direction of the coordinator of health services. A specific proposal from that officer should be made which would address <u>each</u> of these service needs for <u>each</u> facility.
339	Program	One full time Program Director for <u>each</u> institution not already having such a position (Eagle River is currently the only facility having the equivalent position) for essential coordination and administration of classification decisions, contractual and in-house program offerings and work programs.
340 and 341	Institutional and Staff	A systematic methodology is provided for assessing with "reasonable accuracy" the number of security staff required to operate each institution "safely and effectively." This tool will provide correctional management with the opportunity to project <u>optimal</u> staffing needs rather than simply the <u>minimal</u> necessary to operate a given facility. (It remains for corrections officials to apply the outlined method before adequate institutional staffing patterns can be assessed.)
441 to 444	Juvenile to Staff	Manpower estimates for community service personnel for <u>juvenile</u> services are estimated to require 60 line personnel for <u>1978</u> at an estimated cost of \$2,285,320. Staff requirements are provided in the plan as follows: first judicial district = 8; second judicial district = 4; third = 36; fourth = 12. Figures are also provided in the plan for staff requirements and costs for the years 1990 and 2000. (The planners have not specified what proportion of the estimated 60 line personnel recommended for juvenile community services are now assigned, or could be assigned, from existing staff.)

## REFERENCES

### Page Topic

519	Training	Legislation should be submitted for authority and funds which will enable the Division of Corrections to hire personnel to cover positions when the incumbents are absent for training purposes. This additional personnel increment should be equal to ten percent of the Division's authorized personnel spaces. The legislature should appropriate sufficient funds to support all corrections staff training necessary to comply with national standards. Most programs now supported by grant funds (totaling nearly 50% of the current annual corrections training expenditures) should be instated as permanent and essential parts of the state corrections budget. Adequate funds should also be appropriated for contractual training services.
573	Parole	See comment under Statutory Changes (attached), page 573, for legislative recommendations concerning a full time permanent Parole Board of three members.
573	Parole	One administrative assistant position should be added to the Parole Board for a total of two. Two clerical staff positions should be added to the Parole Board for a total of three. The positions of Executive Director of the Parole Board should be reconstituted as that of Staff Director, reporting directly to the Chairman.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS:  
FUNDING ACQUIRED

Discussion

REFERENCES

Page Topic

387 Institutions 1978 Bond Issues:

Topic	Amount	Status
1. Construct and equip Anchorage pre-trial jail facility	\$12,367,000	Replacement
2. Construct and equip Ketchikan pre-trial jail facility	1,992,700	Replacement
3. Construct Fairbanks Youth Facility (open residential facility)	2,400,000	New
4. Renovate Anchorage Sixth Avenue Jail Annex Facility	1,421,800	Renovation
5. Construct Nome Youth Residence Center	792,000	New
6. Construct McLaughlin Youth Center Gym	1,300,000	Addition
7. Construct Juneau State Jail Recreation and Program Facilities	1,300,000	Addition
8. Construct Juneau classroom and learning lab	200,000	Addition
9. Construct Bethel Correctional Facility	3,129,000	Replacement
TOTAL	\$24,902,500	

1979 Legislative appropriation:

10. Provide funds for housing sentenced female inmates	2,000,000	Replacement
--	-----------	-------------

Previous Bond Issue or Legislative Appropriation:

11. Construct and equip Juvenile Center, Juneau	?	New
---	---	-----

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS:  
FUNDING NEEDED

Discussion

REFERENCES

Page Topic

- |     |                       |  |
|-----|-----------------------|--|
| 39  | Community Corrections | Consider multipurpose "community corrections center" which include in one complex the various facilities required for all correctional purposes -- probation and parole staff offices, secure confinement of offenders and halfway house sectors -- a promising proposal for smaller communities, especially where new construction seems to be indicated (e.g., Ketchikan, Bethel, Barrow, 6th Avenue Annex after completion of the new pretrial facility). |
| 385 | Institutions          | Construct and equip a replacement for the Nome Correctional Center for regional sentenced and unsentenced inmates.   |
| 386 |                       | Construct and equip state regional correctional center in Kodiak   |
|     |                       | Construct and equip state regional correctional center in Kenai.   |
| 388 |                       | The Gruzen study recommends a major renovation of the Anchorage Third Avenue Facility. The Moyer group recommends abandonment but offers no recommendation for placement of short term sentenced offenders or those awaiting classification now held at Third Avenue.  |
| 392 |                       | Major renovations are needed at the Fairbanks Correctional Center (\$7,464,000).   |
|     |                       | Major renovations are needed at the Juneau Correctional Center (\$4,760,000).  |
|     |                       | Renovations at both of these facilities are needed for additional inmate housing and program space.  |
| 392 |                       | Construct the originally designed additional two 40-person housing units at the Eagle River Correctional Center and additional industry space (\$3,808,000).   |
| 398 |                       | Construct and equip a 400 person facility in the Anchorage area to house sentenced inmates from the Anchorage area as well as sentenced females from across (  |

## REFERENCES

Page	Topic
------	-------

398	
-----	--

	the state, and any inmates with long sentences from other regions where the regional facilities cannot provide adequate housing for long-term inmates. (The plan cautions that the overall capacity of 400 "may or may not be appropriate" -- implying that any facility of 400 or less would meet national standards for facility capacity.) Cost estimates for various sizes of this facility range from a low of 10 million dollars to a high of over 100 million dollars depending on a variety of policy options and other capacity improvements elsewhere in the system. For example, with renovations or addition to Juneau, Fairbanks and Eagle River facilities (above) a long term facility for 217 is estimated to be required at a cost of \$23,219,000 (in 1979 dollars). A facility of this size and type should have an expansion capability.
--	--

## CONCLUSION

Approximately 30 million dollars of capital improvements have been authorized for expansion and remodeling of an insufficient and out-dated state correctional system. These improvements will only improve upon or replace existing facilities, except for Fairbanks, Nome and Juneau juvenile facilities which are new and not recommended in the plan.

Alaskan policy makers are immediately faced with major decisions which will determine whether additional multi-millions of dollars will be spent on creation of new institutional space or whether lower sums will be directed toward developing alternatives to new prisons and jails.

To reiterate earlier statements in summation:

A fundamental goal of recommendations that this Master Plan has is the provision of the most adequate corrections system for Alaska at the least possible cost. The single most effective means of accomplishing this is to avoid unnecessary incarceration of offenders, thereby avoiding the capital cost of constructing new facilities to accommodate growing inmate populations. Avoidance of unnecessary incarceration, in turn, requires development of a full range of community-based correction programs, including pre-trial release, probation, prerelease and parole supervision. This is the basic strategy advocated throughout the plan.

If cost effectiveness is of paramount importance, the course of action which Alaska must follow is clear. Community programs must be fully funded and staffed to safely divert the maximum possible number of offenders from unnecessary pretrial and posttrial incarceration.